

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

RAGHVENDRA SINGH,

Petitioner,

v.

JEFF MACOMBER, *et al.*,

Respondents.

Case No. 2:24-cv-0881-JDP (P)

ORDER; FINDINGS AND  
RECOMMENDATIONS

On July 17, 2024, the court screened the petition and found that it failed to state a claim. The court granted petitioner thirty days to file an amended petition. ECF No. 13. Petitioner did not timely file an amended petition, therefore, on September 30, 2024, the court ordered petitioner to show cause why this action should not be dismissed for his failure to state a claim, failure to prosecute, and failure to comply with court orders. ECF No. 14. Instead of complying with the order to show cause, petitioner requested time to file an amended petition, which the court granted. ECF No. 16. Petitioner again failed to timely file an amended petition, therefore, on December 4, 2024, the court ordered petitioner to show cause why this action should not be dismissed for his failure to state a claim, failure to prosecute, and failure to comply with court orders. ECF No. 17. Petitioner has not responded to the order to show cause, and the time to do so has passed. Accordingly, dismissal of the action is warranted.

The court has the inherent power to control its docket and may, in the exercise of that

1 power, impose sanctions where appropriate, including dismissal. *Bautista v. Los Angeles Cnty.*,  
2 216 F.3d 837, 841 (9th Cir. 2000); *see* Local Rule 110 (“Failure of counsel or of a party to  
3 comply with these Rules or with any order of the Court may be grounds for imposition by the  
4 Court of any and all sanctions . . . within the inherent power of the Court.”).

5 A court may dismiss an action based on a party’s failure to prosecute an action, failure to  
6 obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules. *See Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53-54  
7 (9th Cir. 1995) (dismissal for noncompliance with local rule); *Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258,  
8 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992) (dismissal for failure to comply with an order to file an amended  
9 complaint); *Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988) (dismissal for failure to  
10 comply with local rule requiring pro se plaintiffs to keep court apprised of address); *Malone v.*  
11 *U.S. Postal Serv.*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (dismissal for failure to comply with court  
12 order); *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (dismissal for lack of  
13 prosecution and failure to comply with local rules).

14 In recommending that this action be dismissed for failure to comply with court orders, I  
15 have considered “(1) the public’s interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the court’s  
16 need to manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public policy  
17 favoring disposition of cases on their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic alternatives.”  
18 *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1260-61 (citation omitted).

19 Here, petitioner has failed to respond to court orders directing him to file an amended  
20 petition. *See* ECF Nos. 13, 14, 16, & 17. Therefore, the public interest in expeditious resolution  
21 of litigation, the court’s need to manage its docket, and the risk of prejudice to the respondent all  
22 support imposition of the sanction of dismissal. Lastly, my warning to petitioner that failure to  
23 obey court orders will result in dismissal satisfies the “considerations of the alternatives”  
24 requirement. *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1262; *Malone*, 833 at 132-33; *Henderson*, 779 F.2d at 1424.  
25 Specifically, the December 4, 2024 order expressly warned petitioner that his failure to comply  
26 with court orders would result in dismissal. ECF No. 17. Petitioner had adequate warning that  
27 dismissal could result from his noncompliance. Accordingly, I find that the balance of factors  
28 weighs in favor of dismissal.

1 Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED that the Clerk of Court randomly assign a district  
2 judge to this matter.

3 Further, it is hereby RECOMMENDED that:


4 1. This action be dismissed without prejudice for failure to state a claim, failure to  
5 prosecute, and failure to comply with court orders for the reasons set forth in the December 4,  
6 2024 order.

7 2. The Clerk of Court be directed to close the case.

8 These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District Judge  
9 assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within fourteen days of  
10 service of these findings and recommendations, any party may file written objections with the  
11 court and serve a copy on all parties. Any such document should be captioned "Objections to  
12 Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendations," and any response shall be served and filed  
13 within fourteen days of service of the objections. The parties are advised that failure to file  
14 objections within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court's order. *See*  
15 *Turner v. Duncan*, 158 F.3d 449, 455 (9th Cir. 1998); *Martinez v. Ylst*, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir.  
16 1991).

17  
18 IT IS SO ORDERED.

19 Dated: January 10, 2025

20   
21 JEREMY D. PETERSON  
22 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28